DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 035 HE 011 029

TITLE	A Report to the President, June 1964. Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia.
INSTITUTION	President's Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia.
PUB DATE	Jun 64
NOTE	50p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; College Administration; *College Planning; *College Role; Community Colleges; *Educational Demand; Educational Problems; Educational Resources; Governing Boards; Graduate Study; *Higher Education; Junior Colleges; Liberal Arts; *Needs Assessment; Public Education; Research Projects; Scholarships; Sciences; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	*District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

The final report of the Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia, which was created by President Kennedy in 1963, is presented. The contents are as follows: the committee's assignment and procedures; educational problems of the District of Columbia; the educational resources and deficiencies of the District; the basic educational need of the District; recommendations concerning the community (or junior) college; recommendations concerning a college of liberal arts and sciences; recommendations concerning noncompetitive scholarships in special curricula; recommendations concerning high-level graduate study and research; and the organization and relationships of District educational institutions. The discussion of the community college and the college of liberal arts and sciences considers the need for the colleges, the nature and purposes of the colleges, the student bodies, and other significant characteristics of the college. The discussion of institutional organization and relationships among institutions considers the separate organization and administration of the two proposed institutions, creation of a Board of Higher Education, and prompt planning and preliminary organization. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167035

A Report

to the PRESIDENT

JUNE 1964

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 011 029

Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 25 cents

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DR. FRANCIS S. CHASE, *Chairman,*
Dean, Graduate School of Education,
University of Chicago

DR. JAMES R. KILLIAN, JR.,
Chairman of the Corporation,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

DR. THOMAS R. MCCONNELL
Chairman, Center for Study of Higher Education,
University of California (Berkeley)

MRS. AGNES MEYER
Civic Leader and Author,
Washington, D.C.

DR. SAMUEL M. NABRIT
President,
Texas Southern University

DR. GEORGE N. SHUSTER
Former President, Hunter College,
Assistant to the President,
University of Notre Dame

DR. JEROME B. WIESNER
Former Director, Office of Science and Technology,
Dean of Science,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

* * * * *

DR. JAMES H. CASE, JR., *Executive Director*

Washington, D.C., June 1964.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have the honor to submit to you the final report of the Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia, created by the late President Kennedy on September 23, 1963.

The members of the Committee wish to express their appreciation of the opportunity to address themselves to the problems involved in this assignment. Education at all levels throughout the United States is a matter of primary importance, and education in the District of Columbia, the capital of this nation, is preeminently so. That both you and President Kennedy have been concerned with the educational needs of the District has been at once a recognition of the seriousness of the problem and an encouragement to the Committee.

While we recognize that as nonresidents of the District (with one exception) we are able to present to you recommendations free of any suspicion of local bias, we also appreciate that we have had the duty to exercise more than ordinary care in determining the facts upon which alone sound conclusions can be based. To the best of our ability we have done so. Moreover, it is encouraging to find that our conclusions correspond with the views expressed to us by many citizens of the District. Community organizations and leading citizens alike have urged upon us the need in the District for two publicly supported institutions of education at the post-high school level, and have stressed their belief that D.C. Teachers College should be replaced by a new institution. Most of these favor the establishment of a new Board of Higher Education for such new institutions as are to be created. While we did not feel bound by their views, we are gratified to know that the institutions which we propose will have this support from District residents.

We have not burdened the report with extensive documentation. Rather, we have directed that appendices, containing staff analyses as well as original reports and other documentary material, be filed in the office of your Advisor for

National Capital Affairs. We should like to note, however, two studies published shortly after our report was completed. *Man, Education and Work*, issued by the American Council on Education, and *Technical Education in the Junior College*, issued by the American Association of Junior Colleges, are in accord with many of our conclusions and recommendations.

We have not felt competent to include in our Report any specific recommendations on the location of either of the two new institutions we have proposed. We recognize that it will not be easy to provide the central and readily accessible location which is necessary to insure that the institutions are available to the greatest number of students. We hope, however, that this problem will become a matter of immediate concern, and that notwithstanding possible delays in its solution the organization of the two colleges, and indeed the operation of at least the community (or junior) college, will begin even while problems of ultimate location are being settled. The need for each of the colleges is urgent. Neither should be required to await a protracted period of site search and construction.

Finally, we should like to express our appreciation for the unstinting cooperation we have received from Francis Keppel, the Commissioner of Education, and from R. Earl Iffert, of his office; for the constant and often decisive assistance given us by Charles A. Horsky, your Advisor for National Capital Affairs; and, of course, for the diligent and effective aid rendered to the Committee at all stages of its work by its Executive Director, James H. Case, Jr.

We have enjoyed the assignment. We trust that our recommendations will provide a helpful basis for further action by you and by the Congress.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS S. CHASE,
Chairman.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. The Committee's Assignment and Procedures	1
II. The Educational Problems of the District of Columbia	4
A. General considerations	4
B. The educational resources and deficiencies of the District	6
C. The basic educational need of the district	9
III. The Committee's Recommendations	10
A. The community (or junior) college	12
1. The need	12
2. The nature and purposes of the community college	14
3. The student body of the community college	17
4. Other significant characteristics of the community college	20
B. A college of liberal arts and sciences	23
1. The need	23
2. The nature and purposes of the college of arts and sciences	28
3. The student body of the college of arts and sciences	29
C. Noncompetitive scholarships in special curricula	32
1. The need	32
2. The recommendation	33
D. High-level graduate study and research	36
1. The need	36
2. The recommendation	39
IV. The Organization and Relationships of District Educational Institutions	40
A. Separate organization and administration of the two proposed institutions	40
B. Creation of a Board of Higher Education	41
C. Prompt planning and preliminary organization	44

PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I. THE COMMITTEE'S ASSIGNMENT AND PROCEDURES

The 1963 message from the late President Kennedy transmitting to Congress the District of Columbia budget stated his concern that "in the Nation's Capital general education beyond the secondary level is not available at a nominal cost, as it is in many major cities and in the States." The evidence of his concern was the appointment of this Committee, with the request that it examine and report on the following issues:

> Should the District of Columbia have publicly supported institutions of higher learning beyond the secondary school level? If so, what type or types of institutions should be established, from junior colleges through graduate centers, and what relationship should any such institution bear to the existing public school system and to the existing universities—particularly Howard, which derives a considerable part of its income from Federal appropriations? Collateral issues which are relevant are the extent to which the unsurpassed resources present in the Federal agencies and their employees can be used or useful; the extent to which any institution should be available to nonresidents of the District, and the manner in which the District can best take advantage in the field of higher education of the opportunities afforded by Federal aid-to-education programs and of new measures which might be enacted.

While every large urban center reflects the characteristics, challenges and potentialities of the entire Nation, an educational structure for the District at the post-high school level

must reflect also the special social, economic, cultural, and educational characteristics of the District itself. Hence, as the Committee immediately recognized, the proper discharge of its assignment required specific information on educational conditions in the District. Early meetings with representatives of the five privately controlled universities in the District, of D.C. Teachers College, and of the public school system of the District greatly aided the Committee in identifying the areas in which it should seek further information. Some materials were ready at hand, but several areas required intensive investigation by the Committee. The following studies have therefore been made by or under the supervision of the Committee's staff:

1. An inquiry into the needs for post-high school education in the District, with special reference to the characteristics of the population to be served and its undeveloped potentials.
2. A comparison of the general characteristics and the educational resources of the District with those of other selected urban centers in the United States.
3. An inventory and analysis of the institutions now offering post-high school educational services in the District, with special attention to the roles of the D.C. Teachers College and the five privately controlled universities in serving the District's needs.
4. An appraisal of the resources of these six institutions for training elementary and secondary school teachers and for offering courses for the upgrading and intellectual advancement of teachers.
5. An analysis of the employment needs of the District, their relation to existing unemployment, especially among young people, and the potentially available supply of persons who might be trained in the skills demanded by prospective employers.

The Committee also sought data on two other subjects: (1) estimates of the number of District secondary school students who could reasonably be expected to pursue their studies in publicly supported institutions of higher education if such institutions were to be established, and (2) local opinion on the District's needs for such institutions.

In pursuit of the first objective, a questionnaire was distributed to and answered by a 10 percent random sample of secondary school seniors living in the District and attending the District's public, private and parochial schools. Further information was obtained on this subject by an analysis conducted with the cooperation of officials of the District's senior public high schools, showing the "college-able" graduates of the class of 1963 who did not enter 4-year colleges full time in the fall of 1963 and the reasons for their failure to do so.

To obtain knowledge of local opinion, a wide selection of District organizations and civic leaders was invited to comment on a number of general and specific questions relating to the problems before the Committee. The Committee also announced publicly that it would welcome written comments on the same problems from other members of the community. Furthermore, to the extent permitted by its schedule, Committee members, both at official meetings and individually, have discussed the problems with a considerable number of persons in the District.

Apart from studies and investigations essentially related to the District, the Committee commissioned several information papers by persons with expert knowledge in specific fields. Papers were written for the Committee by Dr. S. V. Martorana, of the New York State Department of Education and formerly of the U.S. Office of Education, on "The Community College"; by Professor Donald Maley, head of the Industrial Education Department of the University of Maryland, on "Post-High School Technical and Vocational Education"; by Judge Mary Conway Kohler, now a member of the Board of Education, New York City, on "Post-High School Education for Those with Underdeveloped Potential"; and by Dr. Ethel Venables, Nuffield Research Unit, University of Birmingham (England), on "The Pool of Talent for Technical Education and its Identification."

The Committee feels confident that, from all of these sources, it has acquired a sound and adequate basis for its recommendations, and believes that further investigation and documentation would only provide confirmation of its conclusions.

739-620—64——2

II. THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A. General Considerations

Probably never in our history has there been greater recognition of the necessity of education in making available for the general welfare of the United States the talents of *all* Americans, including those now submerged by poverty, disadvantaged by environment, handicapped by inadequate educational backgrounds or blighted by hopelessness. We no longer accept only the advancement of knowledge made by colleges and universities through the education of leaders and professional specialists. We now recognize the potentials of institutions of higher education in the development of persons who do not enter the conventional 4-year college, and the contributions such institutions can make to the solution of the ominous threats to human dignity, order and freedom which arise from unemployment, poverty and lack of access to opportunities for self-realization.

President John F. Kennedy, in his Special Message on Education in 1962, emphasized the role of education in a democracy:

> The concept that every American deserves the opportunity to attain the highest level of education of which he is capable . . . is a traditional ideal of democracy. . . .
>
> For education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life. In short, it is at the same time the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his Budget Message of January 1964, emphasized the function of education in any effective attack on poverty:

> We owe to every young person in America a fair start in life—and this means that we must attack those deficiencies in education, training, health, and

> job opportunities by which the fetters of poverty are passed on from parents to children. . . .

And in his 1964 Manpower Report, after pointing out that "Education must provide, as a basic part of its human development responsibility, the preparation needed for effective participation in our economic life," President Johnson stressed three needs relevant to any consideration of post-high school education:

> We must provide *broad opportunity for education beyond high school.*
>
> We must provide *increased opportunity for education at the postgraduate level.*
>
> We must provide *extensive programs of adult education.*

The Congress is significantly in accord, as is attested by its recent approval of several measures for the improvement of education and educational facilities. Indeed, the Findings and Declaration of Policy of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 recites:

> The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities.

Historically, efforts to relieve the deprivations suffered by disadvantaged segments of the population—the farm population, women and immigrant groups—have depended heavily on opportunities provided for higher education. The land-grant colleges transformed rural life between 1865 and 1940. The opening of opportunities for higher education to large numbers of women through women's colleges, coeducational colleges, normal schools and teachers' colleges has been a fundamental contribution to the improved status of women. State colleges and universities, public junior colleges and urban universities have helped to bring into the mainstream of American life many national and ethnic groups.

Today there is paramount need to provide full educational opportunities for the urban multitudes who are struggling under the burden of economic and cultural handicaps. Provisions for higher education must accommodate persons with the widest range of abilities, previous educational back-

grounds and career goals. No one with the potential ability to profit from higher education should be excluded because of inability to pay tuition or other charges or because of remediable deficiencies in prior education.

Higher education for those to whom it was previously inaccessible produces consequences far beyond their own use of it. Availability makes a crucial difference in the motivation for learning at all levels and for all ages, generating hope and self-esteem among individuals and groups previously relegated to inferior status. Presenting models of successful escape from degrading conditions and providing trained leadership for those still struggling to emerge from an unfavorable background, higher education offers the best hope for community progress in our cities' battles against poverty, sickness, unemployment, and crime.

The Committee has examined the reactions to this educational need in each of the 16 cities in the United States that are comparable to Washington in size (more than 250,000) and that have a substantial (more than 20 percent) nonwhite population. Almost without exception, each has recognized that the need requires the resources of strong public institutions of higher education as well as strong private colleges and universities.

Five of these cities (Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Miami, and St. Louis) have local public junior (or community) colleges with low tuition rates ($250 a year or less). A sixth city, Philadelphia, is in the process of organizing such an institution. Seven cities (Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Houston, Miami, New Orleans, and St. Louis) have the advantage of State-supported colleges or universities—or both—with overall costs, including room and board as well as tuition and general fees, of less than $750 a year. Six additional cities (Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, Detroit, Newark, and Philadelphia) are in States where the all-inclusive costs of attending State colleges or universities are above $750 but below $1,000.

B. The Educational Resources and Deficiencies of the District

In considering the District as one of the 10 largest cities in the United States and as the Capital of the Nation, one is inevitably struck by a number of anomalies. On the one

hand, the District has exceptional human and cultural advantages. Among its unique resources that invite study at many levels, including the very highest, are the functioning of the Congress, the courts and the White House, and the workings of the several departments and agencies of Government. It has great repositories of information, such as the National Archives, the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution, and it is at the heart of an intricate process of collecting and analyzing information on problems related to all aspects of human knowledge. Other resources include the embassies and consulates of foreign nations, the offices of many national and international organizations and agencies, and a continuous stream of visitors—some to convey information, some to influence decisions, some to seek information. A fuller utilization of these resources for higher education and research would generate new knowledge and better-trained personnel for the functioning of Government and other organizations contributing to the national welfare.

On the other hand, the provisions for higher education in the District compare unfavorably in several respects with those of other major cities in this country and with virtually all major European capitals. There are no general public institutions of higher education (Howard University, with its independent board of trustees, is classified as a privately controlled university); the only institution offering low-cost higher education to District citizens is D.C. Teachers College, which offers only the B.S. degree and specializes only in teacher training. Most other major American cities boast one or more public junior colleges or other public institutions of higher education. All other American cities of the size and importance of the District—and virtually every European capital—have more extensive programs of graduate, professional and post-doctoral study and research than are available in the Capital of the United States. All our major cities have provisions for the education of teachers greatly superior to those found here. And all of them also have a wider range of opportunities for post-high school education, both vocational and general.

The District has an impressive array of privately controlled post-high school educational institutions. Its resources in this respect are exceeded in scope and diversity by only a few

cities in the Nation. For valid reasons, however, none of the five universities in the District addresses itself primarily to District residents. None of them is in a position to extend any tuition advantages to residents of the District, and each feels itself to have a national, rather than a local mission.

Howard University, while it accepts a larger number and a higher proportion of Washington residents than any of the other four District universities, continues, like its sister institutions, to feel its basic mission to be national—and more recently international. It has never followed a policy of racial discrimination (indeed, its first graduates were three white women), but it retains a strong sense of national responsibility for offering exceptional educational opportunities to members of the race in whose interest it was founded.

There is impressive evidence, moreover, that the scale of tuition and fees required for attendance at the District universities makes all of them except Howard unavailable to large numbers of high school graduates, particularly from the public schools. Each of the five universities is open to students of any race, yet it is Howard, with its lower student costs, that attracts almost two-thirds of all District high school graduates who attend local universities. During the 4-year period from 1960 through 1963 it admitted 1,166 (63 percent) of the 1,837 students who entered the District universities from the District's senior public high schools.

The evidence that economic factors discourage District high school graduates from seeking higher education is also apparent in a comparison of the percentage of graduates of the several District public high schools who enter college upon graduation. It is significant that this percentage varies directly with the median family income of the families in the area which the school serves. The one public high school serving an area where the median family income is above $10,000 had, during the 4-year period under study, 77.7 percent of its graduates attending college after graduation. The three schools serving areas where the median family income was between $7,000 and $10,000 were next highest (45.4, 53.0 and 45.0 percent, respectively). The three schools serving areas where the family median income was between $5,000 and $7,000 were still lower (27.0, 21.1 and 37 percent). The four schools serving areas where family incomes were below

$5,000 had the lowest percentages—one school excepted (20.6, 18.9, 16.6 and 26.9). It is likewise significant that of this last group of four public high schools, 95 percent of the graduates who did attend a local university upon graduation enrolled at Howard. When the median income of the families in the area served by the school was in the middle range ($5,000 to $10,000), more than six times as large a percentage of these graduates—between 30 and 35 percent—attended other local universities.

C. The Basic Educational Need of the District

The most urgent educational need in the District of Columbia is hope. The public school system is overwhelmingly college-oriented, yet there is no low-cost general college to which its graduates can go. Like every American city today, Washington has its share of families—more than a sixth of the population—who live in poverty and who generally suffer the attendant evils of cultural deprivation and the stifling environment of the slums. Yet, unlike more and more American cities, Washington is without a single publicly supported institution for education at any level beyond the high school—excepting only a teacher-training institution—to help these thousands of persons overcome their handicaps and realize their full potential.

In consequence, a substantial portion of Washington's school population and young adults is now denied—largely because of the meagerness of their own cultural and financial background—all sense of participation in the society for which they are unprepared, and hence largely unneeded and unwanted. Without hope, these persons are in imminent danger of becoming permanently alienated from the dominant culture and values of their community.

For thousands of these children and adolescents, school has no meaning in terms of opportunity. It is more in the nature of a sentence passed upon them to be served until age 16. For they have become convinced, largely through the experience of parents, of older brothers and sisters and of others known to them in their community, that they can look forward to no real part in today's society, let alone to any share in that society's affluence. Thus too many of them drop out

of school as soon as they are able and try, usually without marked success, to compete for a living. Without skills, they are too often unusable by—and hence useless to—the community.

The problem is not simply the familiar syndrome of poverty, cultural deprivation and crushing environment; it is also the absence, as things now stand, of any weapon with which the sufferers may combat these evils. Publicly supported institutions that hold out a credible promise to them, unlike the private colleges and universities from which their own condition excludes them, constitute an effective weapon for this purpose, as evidence from many cities that provide such institutions suggests. Knowledge that these institutions are available will often help to provide motivation when children first enter school. And with motivation, school can become a very different experience. No longer a dreary succession of meaningless lessons and of senseless disciplinary rules, it represents the chance for self-betterment. Usually when these "uneducable" groups have been offered an opportunity their members can translate into terms of immediate meaning *for them*, many in the group promptly begin to display capacities of which they formerly gave no evidence. Such an opportunity is what the Committee believes must be supplied in the District of Columbia.

III. THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The absence in the District of opportunities for virtually every sort of post-high school education for those unable to pay the necessarily high costs of attending privately controlled institutions left the Committee in no doubt about its answer to the basic question before it: "Should the District of Columbia have publicly supported institutions of higher learning beyond the secondary school level?" The clear and simple answer is "Yes." Almost equally clear—if somewhat less simple—is the answer to the subsequent question: "What type or types of institutions should be established?"

To reach its answer to this question the Committee considered the possible need for publicly supported institutions of

various sorts at every level beyond the high school: the trade school; the vocational school; the technical institute; the comprehensive junior (or community) college; the 4- or 5-year college of liberal arts and sciences; such specialized undergraduate schools or courses of study as engineering and business administration; the multipurpose university; the professional school; the graduate school; and the high-level center for graduate and post-doctoral study and research. After reviewing all the possibilities, it submits the following recommendations:

1. The immediate creation of a comprehensive community (or junior) college, publicly supported, that will put within reach of all high-school graduates opportunities for technical and vocational training and for general education leading both to greater personal and civic effectiveness and to further study in a 4-year college or university for those who qualify and seek it.

2. The immediate creation of a college of liberal arts and sciences, also publicly supported, authorized to confer both the baccalaureate and the master's degrees, with a special concern with teacher education (a function it should assume from the D.C. Teachers College) and prepared to offer specialized courses of study as need and feasibility are established.

3. The prompt establishment of a system of noncompetitive scholarships, publicly supported, enabling qualified District students who wish, after 2 years' work in the community college, to pursue special courses of study not offered at the outset by the proposed public college of liberal arts and sciences at an institution where such curricula are available.

4. The early development in the District of a center or centers for high-level graduate and post-doctoral studies, with a Presidential review undertaken within 3 to 5 years to make specific recommendations, if desirable, with respect to ways in which the Federal Government might be helpful in the attainment of this goal.

The basis for and details of these recommendations are contained in what follows.

739-620—64——3

A. The Community (or Junior) College

1. The Need

In an age of technology that constantly requires more specialized skills, our society is demanding, and will continue to demand, an increasing number of workers with skills beyond those obtainable in high school, although not necessarily those that can be obtained only through a 4-year college education. A recent study by the National Science Foundation, for example, forecasts that while the civilian economy will need many more engineers than were thought 5 years ago to be necessary, we also face an acute shortage in the ranks of the skilled craftsmen and technicians. Thus a high school diploma has now become less a terminal point and more a preparation and opportunity for further study and training.

By the same token, the economy will provide fewer and fewer opportunities for young people who approach the world of work with limited educational achievements. We are building massive problems for the future—in welfare, unemployment, poverty and crime—unless we provide a maximum of opportunity for the youth of today to achieve the highest level of education of which they are capable. The United States Commissioner of Education has recently remarked in an address to the American Association of School Administrators: "Unemployment grows whenever educational levels are low, . . . income rises whenever educational achievement is high, . . . poverty and lack of education are always linked."

The District must offer educational opportunity where none now exists. Among those deprived of opportunity are young people whose academic aptitude cannot be demonstrated by conventional measures, largely because of their cultural, economic and educational handicaps. These persons seem, indeed, to be without hope of satisfactory employment because of the inadequacy of their educational attainments. For example, the young men and women who are in the two lower "tracks" in the public schools and who finish high school with academic deficiencies, even when these are remediable, are now inadmissible to any college or university in the District. Most of the children of the more than 30,000 families in the District

with incomes of less than $3,000 are within this group. Also among this group, however, are many average and even above-average young people who lack any adequate opportunity to realize their potential.

The need for maximum educational opportunity—and for the incentive which that opportunity will provide for those who now lack any hope of competing in the world of work—is recognized as a national problem. The Committee agrees with the recent statement by Edwin P. Neilan, then President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in the October 1963 *Junior College Journal:*

> In coming years, we must develop a much larger middle-class group of technical, supervisory, subprofessional people who do not need and perhaps would have difficulty acquiring a college degree . . .
>
> The major challenge that we face is the further evolution and improvement of a voluntary system of education, generated primarily by the efforts of the people themselves, working through their own leaders in communities and institutions.
>
> The community college provides a new dimension and is an essential instrument in the accomplishment of this purpose.

The needs of the District of Columbia in this respect are in no sense unique. In a paper prepared for the U.S. Employment Service in October 1963, "Training for Occupational Skills in the Washington Metropolitan Area," Laure M. Sharp of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., states:

> It is becoming increasingly clear that the preferred training for semiprofessional, technical, submanagerial and office occupations is a general high school education followed by 1 or 2 years of post-high school training. Accumulating evidence suggests that this pattern has become widely accepted in urban areas. Employers prefer to have 19- or 20-year-old beginners, rather than younger workers. . . . Thus, the junior college or community college is becoming increasingly popular as a "transitional" institution, both for transfer to a 4-year institution and for labor market entrance. There is a lack of

> such public institutions . . . especially for D.C. and Virginia residents. . . .

Similarly, the Skill Survey of the Washington Metropolitan Area, prepared in 1963 by the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia, states that "The labor market cannot absorb any increase in unskilled labor," and adds:

> The more education and training a young person has the better job he can expect to get. Some training past the high school level is desired by most employers.

As these citations suggest, the institution in American higher education deemed best fitted to carry the burden of extending education beyond the high school is the comprehensive community or junior college (hereafter referred to as the community college). Many States and cities are making far-reaching plans for establishing or completing a network of such colleges, and are placing on them an increasing share of the task of extending and equalizing the opportunity of American youth. California, Florida, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, and Ohio are among the States that have either established many new 2-year community colleges or announced plans for great expansion of their community college systems. Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Miami, St. Louis, and Philadelphia, among the cities comparable to Washington, either have or are establishing junior colleges.

The Committee believes it imperative that the District become a part of this widespread movement.

2. The nature and purposes of the community college

The nature of the community college recommended for the District can best be summarized in terms of what it should undertake to do. In addition to stimulating and assisting every student to discover his highest potentialities, its purposes should be:

> (a) To provide through education and community life the knowledge and the ideals on which active, informed and responsible citizenship is necessarily based;
>
> (b) To enrich the personal lives of students through both formal and informal contacts with art and literature, with artists and writers—indeed, with all those humane sources of a vision of human greatness;

(c) To train the large number and the great variety of technicians and other skilled persons on whom a highly industralized and rapidly changing society depends;

(d) To offer opportunities for adults to repair their cultural and educational deficiencies, to redirect their abilities and to improve their knowledge and competence; and

(e) To prepare students for further formal education in 4-year colleges and universities.

The unique function of the comprehensive community college is to offer varied opportunities for occupational education reaching from the least complex all the way to those requiring a fairly extensive background in science and mathematics. Technical training at the subprofessional level is a major employment need and will provide the base for the economic improvement of a large number of youth now unserved and untrained for productive careers.

The Committee does not believe it either necessary or appropriate to prescribe the specific offerings of the District's community college which, in fact, ought to remain responsive to changing needs. The present employment needs of the District, as analyzed by the recent Area Skills Survey, would strongly suggest, however, that the curriculum be planned to prepare such semiprofessional employees as technicians in the engineering sciences and in medicine, dentistry and public health, specialized salesmen, business machine repairmen, designers and draftsmen, and nurses (registered and practical). The college should also prepare such skilled clerical employees as secretaries (general and specialized), bookkeepers and office machine operators, and such trades and crafts as mechanics (aircraft, automobile, air-conditioning, refrigeration and others), construction and repair men, and metal workers. The programs of the college in these areas will need to strike a balance between mastery of those skills and techniques that facilitate entry into employment, and comprehension of the basic principles underlying a whole category of occupations. Only such a balance can give craftsmen the capability of acquiring other skills with a minimum of reeducation as machines and processes become obsolete.

It will be important to relate the offerings of the community college to the program of study in the high schools in such a way as to give maximum encouragement to high school students to look forward—and to plan forward—to its vocational programs. This will not involve intensive vocational education in the high school. It will entail anticipatory learning. High school students will acquire the necessary scientific, mathematical or other background for vocational community college curricula more meaningfully if they see its relation to the practice of an occupation or to later educational preparation for an occupation. High school students should visit classes in the college as well as places where they may ultimately work; they should see demonstrated the use of mathematical skills in technical processes; and they should have the opportunity, in classroom or laboratory, of using background knowledge and skill in some of the more elementary of these processes. Teachers and administrators at both the high school and the community college levels must understand and appreciate the importance of motivation, and particularly the relevance of one kind of learning to another, of one level of education to the next.

The Committee believes that in the community college the concept of "continuing education" should take precedence over that of "terminal education." Vocational and technical courses of study in the college should afford ready and effective points of entry into employment, but the doors should always be open to adults who want to improve their skills or retrain themselves for changing job specifications or new job opportunities. Similarly, others who want to remedy their educational deficiencies or enrich their lives culturally should be made welcome by the college. Among these, it seems probable, will be young people who failed to finish high school. Remedying their scholastic weaknesses through special courses offered by the college will qualify many of these persons for registration in one of the institution's formal courses of study.

There will also be older persons who may not want to register in the community college for academic credit. For such persons, an adult education program will constitute a vital function of the college. The Committee is aware that both the public schools of the District and its local univer-

sities are already active in this field. Certain areas of the field that are appropriate to the community college may be developed without duplicating the activities of the other institutions. The Committee believes, however, that even at the expense of some overlapping, the college should concern itself with adult education and should offer a wide variety of courses at nominal cost.

Courses of study in the regular curriculum of the community college may vary in length, depending on the needs of the individual or the requirements of a given occupation. Certainly they should not be padded to conform to an arbitrary and uniform time period of 2 years. It is recommended, however, that the programs offered should not go beyond the first 2 years of college or its equivalent in vocational or technical programs.

While technical education, broadly conceived, is a unique function of the proposed community college, the Committee believes strongly that it should be a comprehensive college, not a technical institute. Such a college appears much more responsive to the interests, needs and talents of the highly diversified population it is to serve. Although the primary purpose of the institution must always be to develop the diverse capacities of its students, rather than to fit them for entrance to a 4-year college, its curriculum should be such as to permit students, particularly those whose talents were not fully developed in high school, to transfer to advanced college work. In California, for example, students whose curricular deficiencies or marginal scholarship made them ineligible at high school graduation for entrance to the State colleges or to the University of California may—and very often do—become fully qualified for admission with advanced standing by successful community college work.

3. The Student Body of the Community College

Admission to the community college should be open to all District high school graduates who show reasonable promise of profiting from its educational offerings. In making its assessment of eligibility for admission, the college must not depend solely on conventional aptitude, achievement and intelligence tests, but must seek other evidences of ability to learn.

Tuition and fees, except for nonresidents of the District, should be kept at a nominal level and should be fully covered by grants in cases of individual need. Only on such a basis will the school achieve its maximum potential for the District.

The studies by the Committee establish that there will be no lack of applicants for admission. For example, answers to a questionnaire addressed in 1962 to seniors in the District's public high schools indicated that more than 55 percent (1,782 students) would be interested in a local public community college if one were available. A still larger percentage—72, or 2,350 students—indicated that in the event they were not accepted for admission to the college or university of their choice, they would apply for admission to a public community college if it existed. Answers to the Committee's questionnaire in January 1964 indicated that about 720 of the seniors who do not plan to continue their education would change their plans and attend a public community college if one were available. Taking everything into account, the Committee envisages an annual entering class of about 1,400 students during the early years of the community college. The number will grow steadily.

The community college will be attractive to many types of students. As an institution maintaining standards of excellence in both course content and instruction, it should and will attract many students of superior ability whose inclinations are toward technical, rather than academic, studies. Many of these students will qualify for transfer to top engineering and scientific institutions for the bachelor's degree. Similarly, as an institution offering the best possible program of general education and basic preparation for later academic work elsewhere, it will provide an attractive and inexpensive alternative for 2 years to immediate enrollment in a 4-year college or university for high school graduates who plan on 4 years or more of study beyond high school. Indeed, studies at the University of California of the relationship between college attendance and the availability of different kinds of local institutions have shown that the presence of a community college induces a higher proportion of the ablest high school graduates to go on to college than the presence of any other single type of higher educational institution.

There is, moreover, a pool of talent at the other end of the spectrum of high school graduates—those whose high school achievement has been below average. It has only recently been recognized that a surprising number of such students can benefit from the occupational curricula offered by a comprehensive community college. Studies of technical education have shown that conventional verbal and scholastic aptitude tests given to students who have suffered cultural and educational deprivation often fail to reveal potential educability. Success in some occupations, while requiring at least a basic level of linguistic ability, may depend as much or more on other aptitudes and achievements. Studies in Great Britain, for example, where there is a widespread system of technical education at many levels, have shown the value of tests of mathematical skill, mechanical comprehension, perception of spatial relationships and the like as a measure of aptitude for technical training.

A liberal policy on admission should not mean, however, that admission requirements must be identical for all courses of study. Just as a multipurpose State university, which may admit any high school graduate of the State, usually demands special requirements for enrollment in, for example, its engineering program, so may the college permit only persons of demonstrated aptitude to enroll in its most demanding programs of technical training or liberal education. On the other hand, the opportunity to change courses upon demonstration of interest and ability in a new venture should never be foreclosed.

Counseling in such a community college is obviously of vast importance. Many young people, confronted with opportunities and exposures beyond anything in their previous experience, will modify their ambitions. Ill-advised and abortive efforts to change courses can be minimized. Promising shifts in objectives can be encouraged. Students, in short, can be aided in realizing their highest potentials if advisors adequate in number, high in competence and genuinely concerned with those they serve are available.

Finally, although the community college should serve primarily residents of the District, nonresidents should be encouraged to enroll upon payment of a tuition high enough to minimize any diversion of District funds for non-District residents. Attendance of nonresidents may well be neces-

739-620--64——4

sary to permit the college to offer courses essential to its function but inordinately expensive when only a few students are registered. And, as noted above, a need does exist among persons who live in the District's suburbs—particularly in Virginia—for educational services of the kind offered by the community college.

4. Other Significant Characteristics of the Community College

The Committee recognizes that it should not attempt to dictate the details of form and organization for the community college, which, in fact, should display a maximum flexibility responsive to the varying needs both of individual students and of the District itself. Two weaknesses that have tended to develop in typical institutions of this kind are, however, of sufficient importance to warrant recommendations of specific safeguards.

Faculty opportunities. A major policy of the college should be to insure that the opportunities and advantages offered to its faculty are commensurate with those normally enjoyed by the faculty of a 4-year college or university. These should include, for example, assurance that provisions for salaries, retirement benefits, academic tenure and the exercise of faculty responsibility shall all be comparable to those applicable to faculty members in institutions of this latter type. Faculty members, even though assigned to full-time teaching duties, should not be isolated from the creative research developments in their own disciplines. To prevent this isolation, there should be strict limitations on teaching loads, generous provision for faculty leaves of absence (usually accompanied by grants) for creative research projects, for teaching for a year in a university active in research (perhaps with regular faculty exchange programs with such institutions), for attending summer or regular university sessions of study in their particular fields, for attending professional meetings, for working in a private or governmental organization that is at the frontier of industrial research and development, or for traveling when travel would enhance their professional competence. These benefits should be extended, so far as practicable, to all members of the faculty.

Emphasis on continuing evaluation. A second major policy of the college should be to minimize the tendencies,

particularly in vocational training, to perpetuate courses or methods of instruction after they have become obsolete and to overlook new opportunities in vocational training. To avoid these tendencies, the Committee recommends two special measures.

First, it proposes that the college establish, at the very outset, a modest Division of Institutional Research and Evaluation. The Division would have the responsibility for continuing studies to determine both the effectiveness of existing educational programs and the opportunities to fill new needs. The Division should serve the teaching staff in improving curriculum and instruction, and the administrative staff in conducting studies of admissions, counseling and organization. Its director should be responsible to the president or academic vice president of the college. It should not determine policy—this is the province of faculty, administration and governing board—but should provide sound and adequate data on which policy can be decided, and should encourage experimentation to enable the college to exert leadership in liberal and vocational education. It should be alert to every possibility for enrichment of the experiences of the students and enhancement of the distinction of the college through the use of scientists and other scholars in governmental agencies and the full exploitation of the unparalleled cultural resources of the Nation's Capital.

Second, the planners and teachers of vocational subjects should maintain close relationships with both management and labor to be sure that the training the college offers remains truly responsive to employment needs. In these days of rapid obsolescence of many specific kinds of skills, training should be as basic and generic as possible. The principles involved in any vocation should be the target—not simply the techniques. All students should have work in the basic academic disciplines to the fullest extent of their capacity to profit from them. Yet intimate and continuing contact with representatives of employers and employees alike will improve the chances of student employment—and employment that utilizes the student's highest abilities. The Department of Labor and the Civil Service Commission should also have important advice to offer on needed changes in curriculum content and design. Advisory councils comprising not only disinterested members of the public but representatives of

potential employers of students and of unions should be created. From these councils there should be drawn panels, some temporary, others standing, to advise with the faculty and staff on specific occupational curricula and to assist students who follow them successfully to find employment.

The Committee hopes that continuing flexibility and imagination in instruction and administration will not only guard the community college from the dangers of obsolescence in curriculum and teaching methods, but also make it a model for emulation by community colleges in other great cities of the Nation.

A work-study program. The Committee recognizes that there are, and will continue to be, many students who will be unable to take advantage of post-high school education even at minimal cost because of their need to support themselves and, in some instances, to contribute to the support of their families as well.

Traditionally, this difficulty has been surmounted by "working one's way through college," and no doubt many students will continue to do just that. There are, however, several factors that make this solution less than adequate to the needs of the District's young people. In the first place, employers' demands are increasingly hard to meet until there has been some real skill training. Second, many of the students who most urgently need money are likely to be least able to find jobs for themselves. Furthermore, the job is too often profitable—if at all—only in terms of money and not in terms of an experience that bears any relation whatever to the student's objectives. Finally, there are many whose sometimes wavering ambition and limited ability to grasp the more theoretical work of the classroom, laboratory or shop need complementing by "real-life" applications of class work in employment.

The Committee recommends, therefore, that a formal work-study program be made a prominent part of the community college plan. Such a program has manifold advantages. Under it trained college officers maintain lists, which are constantly being enlarged, of companies—and, in the District, of Government departments and agencies—prepared to employ students in the work-study program. These officers study the records of each student assigned to them and hold a number of individual consultations to as-

certain his major interests and abilities. They then help to arrange a hiring interview with one or more of the employers who offer jobs suited to the student's needs.

Supervision and review of the student's work on the job, which is an integral part of the program, will teach him not only to identify mistakes and avoid their repetition, but also to accept high standards of competence, punctuality and personal appearance. The student's work in class, moreover, benefits from his experience on the job. Ultimately, as experience has demonstrated, the transition from school to the labor market will be made very much easier; in one community college in which the work-study program is highly developed, 80 percent of the students found jobs on graduation with the employer for whom they had worked in college. Of the 34,000 students now in formal work-study programs in all types of institutions of higher education, about 40 percent regularly do the same.

B. A College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

1. The Need

The recommendation of the Committee that the District establish a college of liberal arts and sciences (hereafter called the college of arts and sciences) is responsive to two needs, both urgent. First, the District should have a completely new physical and educational setting for the vital function of teacher education. Second, the young people of the District should have the opportunity now enjoyed by the young people of all the States to attend a publicly supported institution offering a liberal education at least through the baccalaureate degree. The Committee found it unnecessary to determine whether either need, taken alone, would have led them to the same recommendation. Taken together, they compel it.

First. One of the Committee's most difficult tasks was to reach a conclusion about D.C. Teachers College. Visits were paid to the institution. There were discussions with President Carr and his predecessor, with a number of alumni, and with others in a position to know the institution well. The Committee reviewed the reports of the president of the institution for each of the past several years and the self-evaluation prepared by the college in 1961 for the accrediting com-

mittee of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It has also examined the evaluation made by the Middle States Committee and the correspondence in 1962 between the college and the National Council for Accreditation of Teachers Education, which culminated in NCATE's withdrawal of accreditation.

The Committee has been forced to the conclusion that the needs of the District for teacher training cannot be satisfied by the D.C. Teachers College. The case is clear on more than one count: the restricted outlook, scope and resources of the institution; the gross inadequacy of its physical facilities; and its demonstrated inability to command the support by which it might have remedied its cumulative weaknesses. These points are discussed in order.

(a) Informed persons who have studied teacher education tend to agree that it goes forward best in strong multipurpose institutions where those preparing to teach are in association and competition with those preparing for other professions and where they encounter able minds in the sciences, the humanities and other scholarly fields both among the faculty and among the students. The Committee concurs in this view. Applying its standard to the institution that now exists in the District exclusively to prepare teachers, it finds that institution inadequate. The business of preparing young people for careers in teaching or counseling in our public schools in now recognized as having outgrown such a single-purpose institution. Only the college or university committed to the liberal arts and sciences can provide the rich and exciting environment needed by the prospective teacher. Professional training is most effectively done by concentration in the fifth year after a full exposure of 4 years of liberal education.

During the 1930's, the old normal school was supplanted in concept and form by the 4-year teachers college. So, in turn, the teachers college has grown obsolete as a still more generous concept and form for teacher education has been developed. Today nearly all the former teachers colleges have not only dropped the term "teachers" from their names, but have expanded their outlook and scope to become general institutions of liberal arts and sciences. That the D.C. Teachers College has long sought authorization to join this almost universal movement is to its credit; the fact that it

has failed, largely for reasons beyond its control, has left it unable to fulfill properly even the narrowly specialized function to which it is limited.

(b) As far back as 1949, when the District's segregated school system provided two teachers colleges—Wilson and Minor—in separate buildings, a study by the Strayer Committee led to the following comment in its official report:

> If the District is to provide its youth with teacher education opportunities comparable to those furnished by the public institutions of the 14 States that have populations smaller than that of the District, it will be necessary to expend at least $10 million upon new plant facilities and to contemplate increasing current operating costs by 300 or 400 percent.

In 1955 the two colleges became one institution—D.C. Teachers College—but the physical plant continues to be the same two buildings, a mile apart. Virtually nothing in the way of capital improvements has been done. The third floors of both buildings have been condemned because of fire hazards, and hence are unusable. Neither has a campus, and both are located in crowded neighborhoods that make expansion virtually impossible. Although the Middle States Association in 1961 commended the college "for the excellent progress which it has made in all aspects of the library since 1958," the library is overcrowded; the Middle States evaluation report concluded that "immediate plans for expansion in the present building are necessary."

The same evaluation report noted that "although the science laboratories have been tremendously improved through the purchase of new equipment, the laboratories themselves are small and equipped with outmoded furniture." Research facilities for faculty and advanced students are lacking; laboratory facilities for language work are grossly deficient; and studio facilities for art work are scarcely better.

Quoting once more from the Middle States Report:

> The physical education and recreation facilities are extremely poor. There are no athletic fields, swimming facilities, handball courts, squash courts, or special rooms for corrective exercises, modern dance, bowling, etc. In addition there are no out-

door recreation areas except three tennis courts, and the gymnasia are undersize and obviously built in another era. With such facilities it is doubtful that the college should have a physical education major.

In fairness it should be said that the Report acknowledged that "on the basis of performance," as a result of imaginative planning of the faculty, "the physical education program is one of the strengths of the college." This may prove that bricks can be made for a time without straw; in the long run, however, there simply must be straw if there are to be bricks of consistently high quality.

(c) Many American communities have found it difficult to obtain the funds required to meet the insistent demands for improving and expanding their educational facilities. The District has been no exception; indeed, its dependence for appropriations upon the Congress rather than upon its own local authorities has made its task more complex. Attempts to secure adequate financing of its single public institution of higher education are further complicated by the fact that the same body that bears the responsibility for the elementary and secondary public schools has been obliged to carry the responsibility for the D.C. Teachers College as well. It is scarcely surprising to find, in these circumstances, that the Board of Education has felt obliged to give priority to school needs that simply could not be deferred. The inevitable effect on the physical plant of the college has been noted in some detail, but its efforts to strengthen itself have been frustrated in other ways as well. The final result is a fatal impairment of its standing.

The formal qualifications of the present faculty of the college are still impressive: Of the 55 members of the faculty and administrative officers listed in the most recent catalog, 28 (including all those with the rank of full professor or associate professor) hold a doctor's degree, and all the rest master's degrees. Nonetheless, the multiple problems of the college make the task of filling vacancies in the staff as they occur a grave one; a deterioration in caliber of personnel is inevitable.

The student body, despite heroic efforts by the college to raise admissions standards and maintain a high level of academic work, cannot be called first-rate. The Middle States Association noted that the 1959 freshman class "scored

significantly below the national median on the Iowa English Placement Test." In 1962, entrance requirements were raised sharply. As a result, according to estimates of the school authorities, at least 100 formerly acceptable students were denied admission, and the full-time enrollment of freshmen dropped from 274 in 1962 to 159 in 1963, a drop of 42 percent in a single year. The college simply does not appeal to the ablest students from the District schools or elsewhere (only 3 of the 613 students enrolled full time in the fall of 1963 were nonresidents of the District). Indeed, between 1958 and 1963, at a time when the need for teachers was increasing both nationally and within the District, the number of graduates from the college declined from 123 to 69—a decrease of 44 percent.

All this was reflected in the announcement in 1962 by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education that it was withdrawing accreditation from the college because "the prospects of improving the facilities, maintaining a competent faculty and attracting an able student body were not good enough to justify [its continuation]."

It goes without saying that it would be unthinkable to eliminate the D.C. Teachers College without substituting an institution having resources more adequate to the responsibilities entailed. Not only is it the one publicly supported college available to District residents, but it is also a major resource of the District's public schools. About 75 percent of the graduates of the college enter teaching—about 85 percent of them in the District. As of a year ago, one-third of the entire public school teaching staff—1,673 teachers—were graduates of D.C. Teachers College or its predecessors. Over the years, it has also been a major, though inadequate, resource for inservice training and professional courses for the public school teachers.

Second. The other need to which the recommendation of the Committee is responsive is not simply the obvious disadvantage suffered by District residents in comparison with those of the 50 States, to all of whom publicly supported colleges or universities are available. This disadvantage, of course, affects every District high school graduate. But, more significantly, the Committee's analysis indicates that there are a substantial number of students who graduate from high schools in the District for whom the effect of this

discrimination is not just a higher price for further education, but a complete deprivation and denial of opportunity. These are the high school graduates who are demonstrably able to profit by a general college education, but who cannot do so because of its cost. The achievements of these students are comparable to those of students who can and do go on to a 4-year college, either in one of the local universities or elsewhere.

That there are many such students is certain; just how many is discussed later in this report. They particularly deserve an opportunity for a post-high school education equal to that available to their fellow high school students throughout the United States.

2. The Nature and Purposes of the College of Arts and Sciences

The college of liberal arts and sciences which the Committee recommends should therefore be designed to meet the needs of District students for liberal education, while emphasizing also preparation for classroom teaching and training of special educational personnel, including counselors for the elementary and secondary schools and for the community college. It should grant both baccalaureate and master's degrees in academic and teaching fields, particularly since only the master's degree will qualify a graduate for permanent appointment in the District's secondary schools.

It will be important, however, that the college of arts and sciences recognize its responsibility to provide entirely new opportunities for higher education for young people of the District who do *not* aspire to a teaching career. In this area, the Committee believes that the college of arts and sciences should concentrate its attention at the outset on offering a strong core of basic liberal studies: in the sciences (physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics); in the social studies; in the humanities; and in the graphic and performing arts. In time, however, as needs of the community may be demonstrated, it should be prepared to consider more specialized undergraduate work. In the Committee's view it is preferable, for the present at least, to meet the needs of District students for study in these specialized fields in a manner that puts less of a burden on the college during its early years.

The existence of the comprehensive community college, which should also offer, *inter alia*, the same liberal studies, will permit the college of arts and sciences to emphasize upper-division work and graduate study through the master's degree. It will also permit the college of arts and sciences to adopt standards of admission and of academic performance comparable to those of other colleges of good standing. Neither of these statements should be taken to mean that it should not accept freshmen, but these should be "college-ready" as well as "college-able"—an important distinction that further illuminates one of the crucial roles of the community college in transforming students of the latter category into students fully qualified for academic work of a high order.

This citation of the complementary roles of the two recommended institutions suggests, as it is intended to do, that there should be the closest cooperation between them. This point is further developed below in the discussion of the organization and relationships of the institutions. It goes without saying, moreover, that the college of arts and sciences should likewise enjoy the special features recommended for the community college, such as the fullest range of opportunities for the teaching faculty and the benefits of a Division of Institutional Research and Evaluation.

3. The Student Body of the College of Arts and Sciences

Admission to the college of arts and sciences should recognize the need to provide a college education to District high school graduates who are now deprived of it because of its cost. Tuition, therefore, should be kept at a modest level. While the Committee does not wish to recommend a specific figure, it notes that the cost of attending D.C. Teachers College—a $70 general fee rather than a tuition charge—has not appeared to be a major hardship to those who wished to attend. For nonresidents of the District, to whom the college should be open, the tuition can appropriately be set at a considerably higher figure. The work-study program recommended for the community college should also be a feature of the college of arts and sciences.

Since the college of arts and sciences will replace D.C. Teachers College, it will at once attract the kind of student who has hitherto attended that institution. Indeed, it should

attract many more able students interested in careers in education than the D.C. Teachers College now is able to do. The recent drastic decrease in the student body and in the size of the graduating class reflects a cumulative lack of confidence in the adequacy of the existing facilities and educational services. The college of arts and sciences recommended by the Committee should promptly reattract in substantial numbers qualified students graduating from high school in the District whose career goals lie in the educational field.

The student body of the college will also include a substantial number of qualified District high school graduates who do not aspire to teaching but who now, for economic reasons, must forego education beyond the high school. The Committee has devoted much effort to the problem of obtaining reliable data on the need for the college of arts and sciences in terms of the number of District high school graduates who have the ability but lack the opportunity to attend such an institution.

To this end, a careful analysis has been made of existing studies, and the Committee has initiated two further studies of its own—one with the help of teachers, counselors and principals in the District's senior high schools, and the other (a questionnaire) with the additional help of a 10 percent sample of all members of the current senior class who reside in the District and who attend its public, private, or parochial schools.

Based on all the information available, the Committee estimates that at present enrollment levels there will be annually between 350 and 400 "college-able" graduates of the District's public high schools (other than those preparing to teach) who would not go to college under existing circumstances but who would seize the opportunity to do so if there were a publicly supported college of arts and sciences in the District. To these should be added a much smaller number of students similarly situated from the approximately 1,100 students who annually graduate from the District's private and parochial schools. Furthermore, the Committee has had no hesitation in assuming that the college of arts and sciences will also attract from 200 to 250 students interested in a career in teaching or some other type of educational work.

The Committee concludes, therefore, that the college of arts and sciences could be expected, even at the outset, to meet the need and desire for higher education of at least 600 District secondary school graduates each year who are "college-able" but who can afford to continue in school only in a publicly supported institution. The Committee is also strongly convinced, as it has already stated, that denials of educational opportunity of this magnitude must not be allowed to continue.

Moreover, there are factors which, in the judgment of the Committee, will further increase the potential enrollment of the college of arts and sciences in even the next decade. School enrollment in the District is growing. Improvement in the schools, which current awareness of weaknesses and resolute efforts to remedy them presage, should safely deliver a much larger proportion of 6th-grade pupils into 10th grade and 10th grade pupils to the graduation platform for their diplomas. The community college recommended by the Committee will certainly have an effect. The incentive supplied by the opportunity to receive the first 2 years of college at low cost should increase not only the number of boys and girls who finish school, but also those who are ready to go on to the upper years of college. In addition, financial relief offered by a publicly supported educational opportunity for the first 2 years of college work will certainly help the financially marginal family to extend the college experience for its son or daughter over a longer period. The rising demand for college education throughout the Nation will increasingly tax the educational facilities of existing colleges and universities everywhere, and District students will be increasingly dependent upon District educational institutions. Finally, if a program were to be created that enabled boys and girls to find remunerative employment during the course of their post-high school education (and perhaps even during high school), still more students would be able to surmount their economic handicaps and continue their formal education.

A final word is appropriate on one of the earlier studies—the 1959 report by Booz, Allen and Hamilton. This report estimated that as of that time there were only 175 to 200 "college-able" students per year among the public high school graduates who failed to enter college—a figure which the au-

thors of the report doubted to be large enough to warrant the establishment of a senior college. The 1959 report, however, assumed that the D.C. Teachers College would continue as the teacher training institution. Had all the high school graduates interested in an educational career been added to its 175–200 total, its basis for judgment would have been radically different. Moreover, its 175–200 estimate was based on a single criterion of college ability—an I.Q. score of 100 or more—a criterion which the Committee believes to be inadequate and misleading. Indeed, the 1959 report itself reveals that in several schools many more students attended college than had an I.Q. score of 100 or higher. The Committee believes that the I.Q. test has reliability in predicting college success chiefly when it is applied to persons familiar with the prevailing culture and generally underrates the ability of culturally deprived persons. The judgment of teachers, counselors and principals as to college ability, which the Committee requested be applied to the graduates of the District high schools in 1963 who did not go to college, led the Committee to estimate that the number of such students who would take advantage of the opportunity to attend a public college of arts and sciences, if available, was double the 175–200 students estimated by the 1959 report.

C. Non-Competitive Scholarships in Special Curricula

1. The Need

Both the community college and the college of arts and sciences will normally offer to students 2 years of preparatory work adequate for even specialized courses of study such as engineering and business administration. To impose upon the college of arts and sciences at the outset responsibility for offering the last 2 years of work in such courses, however, would put too great a burden all at once on that institution. Yet the Committee is unwilling to accept a situation in which qualified District students continue to be denied an opportunity to complete such specialized courses—an opportunity enjoyed by residents of any of the 50 States. Furthermore, there is a heavy demand, both nationally and in the District, for architects, engineers, economists, accountants and other professional personnel. It is in the public interest

to fulfill what is at once a need of students and a demand of society.

2. The Recommendation

To meet this need, the Committee recommends that a noncompetitive scholarship program be provided for students in these special areas. A student who has been accepted for admission to the junior class of an accredited college or university equipped to provide the course of study he seeks should receive a grant in such an amount as is required to enable him to attend that institution. He should have unlimited choice among local and other institutions, subject to a demonstration that his choice is appropriate to his objectives. Moreover, in the judgment of the Committee, such a scholarship program should be put into effect immediately, rather than being deferred until after the college of arts and sciences has been organized. Indeed, until it has been organized, consistency and the urgency of the need alike suggest that the scholarship program might well apply to students in all courses of study (except teacher education while the D.C. Teachers College continues to operate) to be offered in the college of arts and sciences.

The Committee is firmly persuaded that permanent reliance on such a scholarship system is not a substitute for the proposed college of arts and sciences. Its reasons are stated in a later portion of this Report. It does wish to point out, however, that scholarships to be provided initially for students taking the last 2 years of their undergraduate work in special fields will relieve the new college of arts and sciences of the necessity of introducing prematurely a large number of specialized curricula. There should be no reluctance, therefore, to make the scholarship adequate in size and number. The principle that higher educational opportunities should be within economic reach of all should not be compromised by an inadequate scholarship program.

The Committee is aware that in most colleges and universities tuition charges do not cover the costs of education. In the absence of special provisions, the District might thus be imposing a financial loss upon existing institutions by utilizing a scholarship program to supply its own unmet needs. The Committee suggests, therefore, that a supplementary "cost of education" grant, remitted directly to the

institution attended by the student, should also be considered. Consideration should also be given to the occasional use of noncompetitive scholarships for District students working for their first professional degree or their doctorate. Some subsidies are available from various sources for work at this level, but funds to supplement present provisions for graduate fellowships when necessary would insure full opportunity for all qualified candidates.

* * * * * * *

In formulating recommendations A, B and C above, the Committee has held to the conviction that residents of the District need, and should no longer be denied, the opportunity enjoyed by all other residents of the United States: that of obtaining post-high school education provided with public support. It has recognized, however, that this opportunity might be provided in several ways. In reaching its conclusion that the District should establish a new, publicly supported college of arts and sciences, it considered several alternatives. Two of them warrant brief statements.

First, the Committee considered, and rejected, the possibility of providing (except temporarily) the opportunity for a college education by relying solely on individual scholarships or grants that would permit District high school graduates to attend institutions already in existence.

Several considerations militate against this solution. To be effective in meeting the District's needs and placing the graduates of District high schools on a parity with high school graduates elsewhere in the United States, the scholarships would have to be available to all students accepted for admission in an accredited institution of higher education—such as those available to veterans under the GI bills. In no other way could scholarships or grants achieve what is needed—the maximum of incentive for high school students who can profit by a college or university education. As a practical matter, however, the likelihood of continuing appropriations over the years of sums large enough to accomplish this purpose seems remote. The political uncertainty inherent in such annual appropriations would make it extremely difficult for young people to make the plans that are increasingly required to gain admission to colleges and universities of good standing. The same uncertainty would greatly complicate the problems in admissions and general administra-

tion of the institutions on which District students in any substantial numbers would rely for their educational needs.

Moreover, a system of scholarships or grants would do nothing to resolve the urgent problem of the inadequacy of D.C. Teachers College, unless, of course, the institution were to be abolished and its students, too, were subsidized for training elsewhere. The Committee has already expressed its belief that the abolition of that institution without putting another institution in its place is unthinkable. Furthermore, such a course would deprive the District of provisions for inservice training and continuing education for professional personnel, which should be important elements in the program of the proposed college of arts and sciences.

The Committee has been conscious, throughout all its deliberations, that its recommendations for meeting the needs of the Nation's Capital should be broadly applicable to other American cities as they seek to solve their own educational problems. If the Nation were now facing an era of contracting college demand, a case might conceivably be made for avoiding the creation of new institutions. Instead, we are entering an era of demand that will require unparalleled expansion of college facilities. Under these circumstances, no great city can evade its responsibility to its young people by demanding that existing private institutions absorb a great and growing number of students who perforce must look to them for educational opportunity. The appropriate response must be in terms of bricks and mortar for new basic educational facilities publicly financed at appropriate local levels. The Committee's recommendation that existing facilities and resources of specialized courses of study be utilized, at least temporarily, through a supplementary system of publicly financed, noncompetitive scholarships does no violence to this principle; complete reliance on such a scholarship system would.

Second, the Committee considered, in accordance with the terms of its assignment quoted at the beginning of this report, the possibility that Howard University might itself provide the services to be performed by the comprehensive community college or the college of arts and sciences, or both. The Committee, however, rejected this possibility. It does not believe that Howard can or should be obliged to focus its attention primarily on District needs. Unless it

were to move in a direction quite different from that defined both by its long tradition and its current aspirations, it could not expect to absorb a greatly increased number of students from the District. The Committee respects and approves the current efforts of Howard to contribute to the education of foreign students, particularly from the countries of southeast Asia and Africa. The attempt to impose on Howard a quite different mission—that of a university for the District of Columbia—would seriously impair Howard's capacity to discharge effectively the vital responsibilities it now carries with distinction.

It is particularly important, in the Committee's judgment, that Howard should not assume the role outlined for the community college. That college, for reasons discussed below, should be independent of any 4-year college or university. Here it need only be noted that the differences in purpose and function of the two institutions make them, as experience has shown, unsuitable for combining into a single organization.

D. High-Level Graduate Study and Research

1. The Need

It has often been pointed out that Washington has the unhappy distinction of being one of the very few major capitals in the Western World without a truly outstanding university. Many persons who have examined the educational resources of the District have emphasized the importance of developing in the National Capital a major new program of advanced study and research. Thus, for example, a paper prepared for the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia under the auspices of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., on "Training for Occupational Skills in the Washington Metropolitan Area," reaches the conclusion that "Obvious gaps in the existing educational facilities are most conspicuous at two levels: the graduate or professional school programs, and the junior college." The document continues:

> Limiting the discussion to the topic under consideration here—skill needs of the Washington Metropolitan Area—leaves out what is perhaps the strongest argument for expansion of higher education in the Nation's Capital: the desirability of

> having close to the councils of Government a major center of higher learning with the intellectual and technical resources, the prestige and the stimulation it would provide. . . .

Strong areas of graduate study and strong professional schools may be found among the five universities located in the District, but we believe that the leaders of these five institutions would readily agree that the sum total of these areas of excellence does not yet add up to a distinguished and comprehensive program for graduate, professional and post-doctoral studies. For example, graduate work and research in engineering, the physical sciences and the life sciences must be further strengthened. In addition, graduate work in education is far below the national level at a time when demands for specialized educational personnel are increasing in the District as well as nationally.

The Committee is aware that the five local universities, in January 1964, announced a consortium in graduate education. This encouraging action can certainly contribute to the strengthening of the total resources of the District, but we believe that it is only one of several necessary steps. If an adequately comprehensive and truly distinguished program of graduate studies is to become available in the National Capital, large additional funds will be required.

The Committee envisages an array of resources for graduate and advanced studies that would involve further strength and capacity in such professional graduate schools as engineering and in the arts and sciences. It would require the basic research that must always be intimately associated with graduate study. It would also provide opportunities for post-doctoral studies—studies that are rapidly growing in the leading universities of the country. It would provide opportunities for inservice graduate study on the part of those who work in the District and wish to augment their professional training. And finally, it would certainly provide for opportunities in continuing education for mature professional people in order to counter the intellectual obsolescence which occurs in this period of rapid advance in so many fields.

Certainly it is anomalous that a paucity of graduate and professional schools should exist at the same time that the resources of the Federal Government in the Washington area

remain relatively untapped by the educational community. Major Federal centers for research in the physical and life sciences are located either in the District itself or a short distance away. These include such installations as the National Institutes of Health, the National Bureau of Standards, the Naval Research Laboratory, the Smithsonian Institution, the Agricultural Research Center, and the Goddard Space Flight Center. In addition, there are included on the staffs of Federal agencies many of the Nation's foremost experts—often with years of experience at institutions of higher learning—in economics, law, statistics, accounting, social science and other fields. As plans progress for consideration of public support for additional graduate and professional education programs, maximum effort should be made to foster a close working relationship with Government laboratories and personnel. The Committee has no doubt that such an arrangement would be of mutual benefit both to the programs and to the Federal Government.

Not only does the District itself have need for vigorous programs of graduate study and research; so, too, does the Nation. There is widespread agreement that by 1970, the Nation should seek at least to double its output of doctorates in the sciences, engineering and mathematics, and there are many other disciplines in which comparable expansion is indicated if national requirements are to be met. To increase the overall output of doctoral degrees to any such extent requires not only an expansion of existing centers of strength but the creation of new ones. It would be of great advantage to the Nation as a whole if one of these new centers of strength could be in the Nation's Capital.

To this national need and the argument in favor of having "close to the councils of Government a major center of higher learning with the intellectual and technical resources, the prestige and the stimulation it would provide" should be added the argument that the Nation's Capital itself greatly needs the industrial and research development that has been occurring in the United States wherever genuinely impressive resources in graduate study and research exist. Washington is still far from achieving its rightful place in this respect. In terms of the enrichment of employment opportunities for District and area residents, a new and significant

element would be added to the intellectual, cultural and economic life of this community.

President Kennedy said last year in his message to Congress on Education:

> We need many more graduate centers, and they should be better distributed geographically. . . .
>
> . . . The distressed area of the future may well be one which lacks centers of graduate education and research. . . .

The Nation's Capital should not be permitted to become such a distressed area through lack of adequate resources for graduate study and research.

2. The Recommendation

While the Committee believes that the early development of a new institution or a new program to provide for high-level graduate and post-doctoral studies in the District is of the utmost importance both for the District and for the Nation, it makes no recommendation for the creation of a new center for this purpose at this time. With the announcement of the five-university consortium in graduate study, the local institutions have taken a first step toward strengthening this vital phase of their work. Their plans and future development are properly the responsibility of the leadership and governing boards of the institutions themselves. In the spirit of lending encouragement to these institutions, we do, however, express the hope that a major effort can be undertaken to achieve within the District the resources of faculty, facilities and endowment that will be needed to provide ultimately for graduate study and research of high distinction. Substantial progress toward this objective may be achieved through cooperative action among the universities, but it will also most certainly require major efforts on the part of the individual institutions as well. We suggest that the goal we envisage represents an opportunity of great significance for those major agencies that provide funds for the advancement of education in the United States, including individuals, corporations, foundations and the Federal Government itself.

On the basis of these considerations, the Committee recommends that within 3 to 5 years the President request another review of the status of graduate study and research

in the District for the purpose of making, if desirable, specific recommendations with respect to ways in which the Federal Government should lend its aid toward the achievement of the goals the Committee has outlined.

IV. THE ORGANIZATION AND RELATIONSHIPS OF DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The Committee has not undertaken to draft the authorizing legislation that will be required to implement its recommendations. There are, however, three matters with which such legislation will deal on which the Committee feels impelled to express an opinion.

A. Organization and Administration of the Two Proposed Institutions

The Committee strongly urges that each of the two institutions it has recommended—the community college and the college of arts and sciences—should have its own faculty, administrative staff and physical plant. While there would be advantages in locating the two institutions reasonably close to each other in order that certain facilities such as libraries could be utilized in common, the administrative union of the two facilities into a single institution would seriously compromise one or the other, or even both.

Throughout the United States, very few 4-year institutions offer as part of their overall program the terminal technical and general education programs characteristic of the community college. Technical education has its own rationale, its own curricular style and, most importantly, its own relationship with the field of occupational employment. The 4-year college or university should certainly teach effectively at all levels, but inevitably its attention will most often be on its advanced courses, the scholarly activities of its faculty, and the inculcation of scholarly attitudes in its students. The community college, on the other hand, can concentrate on undergraduate training in its vocational and technical programs and on the best possible programs of general education and basic preparation for later academic work. These quite different emphases are extremely difficult to maintain within a single institution.

Technical education, moreover, needs its own teaching staff, whose background, training, interests and attitudes are ordinarily different from those in the older academic disciplines. With these differences in orientation, the teaching staff of a comprehensive junior college is unlikely to work effectively or in harmony with the staff of the senior college. The curriculum for the electronic technician, for example, is not the same as that of the first 2 years for the electrical engineer, and the faculty in electrical engineering may neither understand nor take any interest in a program for technicians.

Moreover, the standards for admission to the community college must accommodate a far greater range of abilities among its applicants than those of the college of arts and sciences, and must be based on quite different criteria. The comprehensive community college should, as already noted, attract many students of high ability, but it should also admit anyone who may profit from its courses, and should actively encourage even the low achievers in high school to undertake further occupational training and as much general education as they can assimilate. The college of arts and sciences, on the other hand, should maintain substantially higher academic standards for admission. If combined into a single institution, however, the tendency would be overwhelming to regard the community college as simply a place for the less able students—and, in that way, to deny to it sources of strength that are essential to its success.

B. Creation of a Board of Higher Education

The Committee is also firmly convinced that the responsibility for the governance of the two institutions should be vested in a Board of Higher Education that is entirely separate from the Board of Education now responsible for the District's public schools.

In the first place, there is a vast difference between the administration of a going institution and the creation of a new one. The Committee is fully conscious of the multitude of problems, including the articulation of the programs of the two institutions, that will require the best effort of the best and most dedcated citizens who will serve on the Board of Higher Education during the formative years of the new institutions it has recommended. Imposing these problems

on a board already heavily committed to the grave responsibilities for the proper administration of a huge public school system would almost ensure that those problems would not and could not get the attention they will deserve and require.

More basically, however, general experience throughout the United States has again and again pointed up the advantages of separating completely the responsibility for the public schools from the responsibility for institutions of higher education. The structure and procedures of institutions at the two levels—and hence the role of the governing board in each case—are very different. In an institution of higher learning, the faculty has far greater responsibility and authority than does the teaching staff of an elementary school or a high school. The board of trustees of a college or university wisely leaves the establishment and maintenance of academic standards, the design of curricula and the methods of teaching in the hands of the faculty, with the president giving assistance and guidance. Responsibility for the finances of the institution, the appointment of its chief administrative officers, and such major decisions as the addition or (less frequently) the abandonment of special schools or academic divisions within the institution, are the main duties of such a board. But so long as the presiding officer of the faculty—the president—enjoys the confidence of his board and his faculty, he and his teaching colleagues accept great responsibility and enjoy relative autonomy.

This is not the *modus operandi* of a public school system, and most school boards familiar with the practices of the latter would find it not only strange but profoundly disquieting. The District Board of Education is not essentially different from most. No disparagement is intended in stating the belief of the Committee that, inevitably, a single board cannot easily or effectively accommodate to two such completely different systems of instituitional governance or accept the diverse roles that follow.

There will, of course, be problems that relate to both boards, and the need for liaison at both the policy and the operational levels is obvious. While there are many devices to facilitate the required cooperation between boards, only one condition is essential: a genuine willingness to work in concert. Where such a spirit exists, cooperation at the ad-

ministrative staff level, which is generally the most necessary and effective level, is relatively easy, and occasional policy problems involving both boards can readily be dealt with by either informal discussion or by a request more formally made by a representative of one board to appear before the other.

The Committee is also of the opinion that a method of selecting the Board of Higher Education different from that used for the selection of the Board of Education would be desirable. This country has a strong tradition that the boards governing its public schools should be composed predominantly of laymen and should be genuinely representative of the community served by the school system. In practice, most school boards are elected, and while this procedure may create problems from time to time, it has led to an active and wholesome participation in school affairs by parents of schoolchildren and by many citizens who have a disinterested concern for the welfare of the community. The tradition itself has grown naturally because, at one time or another, the public schools affect virtually every citizen in every community. With this concern has also grown a considerable degree of understanding of the issues involved.

In the realm of higher education—even publicly supported higher education—no such tradition has as yet been created. It may also be said that the conditions of widespread concern and of understanding of the issues are less notably present regarding the procedures and results of higher education. Special care must be taken, therefore, to find persons of the highest degree of knowledgeability to preside over the affairs of all our institutions of higher learning, and particularly of the two new colleges recommended for the District.

The Committee suggests that the Board of Higher Education for the District of Columbia should be an appointive, rather than an elective, board. Its membership should not be smaller than 9 nor larger than 15. A majority of its members should be persons who have resided in the District for a minimum of 6 or 7 years. Terms of office should be for a period of 4 to 6 years and should be so arranged that the term of some members expires each year. The members should be selected essentially for the wisdom and skill they can contribute to guarding, guiding and strengthening the new institutions. They should also be broadly representa-

tive of the District and its highest interests. They should be removable only for cause.

The appointive power, the Committee believes, should be in the Board of Commissioners. The Committee suggests, however, that serious consideration be given to a procedure under which the Board of Commissioners would appoint a Nominating Committee of outstanding District residents. The Nominating Committee (whose members would themselves be ineligible for nomination) would then submit a panel of nominees for Board vacancies, with at least three names for each vacancy. The Board of Commissioners would then make its appointments exclusively from that panel.

The Committee is well aware that no system of making appointments can be fully protected from the possibility of abuse. The procedure it has suggested is no exception, but it does put real responsibility upon the highest officials of the District, while giving an important advisory function to other representative leaders of the community.

C. Prompt Planning and Preliminary Organization

Finally, the Committee recommends that the Board of Commissioners provide as soon as possible for preliminary planning and site selection and for estimates of the expenditures that will be needed in establishing and operating the two institutions. This planning should of course explore the possibilities for both interim and permanent locations and establish as definitely as possible the amounts of Federal aid that may become available to the District for the two proposed institutions under such recent laws as titles I, II and III of the Higher Education Act of 1963 and Public Law 88–210.

The Committee believes that it is of great importance that the Board of Higher Education be appointed at the earliest possible time so that it may undertake promptly the general supervision of the organization of the two colleges. This undertaking will require that the Board immediately appoint the two presidents and, with their advice, the directors of the two Divisions of Institutional Research and Evaluation. They, in turn, will be able to start the all-important process of recruiting faculties and planning programs.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1964